Results Framework Security and Rule of Law (Annual Plan 2020)

Impact	**Achieving Legitimate Stability and Sustainable Peace in Conflict-Affected States**						
Long-term outcomes	**1. Human Security** Reduced levels of violence and levels of fear experienced			**2. Rule of Law** Strengthened rule of law so that people are better able to access their rights through fair, efficient, impartial, independent and accountable institutions			**3. Peace processes & political governance** States, regional and local authorities and societies at large are able to effectively prevent and resolve conflict in a non-violent and inclusive manner
Cross cutting	1. More informed (evidence-based) policy & increased conflict-sensitivity, PVE-sensitivity and gender-sensitivity of programming, policy and practice, with a focus on prevention (early warning/early action). 2. In countries with a Dutch military presence support is coordinated with other international efforts; Dutch and international support includes a long-term stabilization lens in which there is adequate attention and implementation of the development/stabilization component of the integrated approach (military, political, development).						
Medium-term outcomes	**1.1 Security providers and national security policy** Security providers (international/national/formal/informal) perform their tasks more effectively, accountably, inclusively and are more transparent and responsive towards local security needs	**1.2 Personal Safety** Physical threats to personal safety posed by landmines and other explosive hazards are reduced	**1.3 Preventing Violent Extremism** Violent extremist groups/organisations have become less attractive to vulnerable groups - especially youth - because better alternatives are available	**2.1 Access to justice** Increased awareness of rights and use of fair and effective formal and informal justice systems by people from all groups	**2.2 Justice sector reform** Legal frameworks are revised and justice institutions are more able to perform their tasks independently, fairly, effectively, accountably, and in better coordination	**2.3 Transitional justice** Transitional justice mechanisms address more effectively legacies of human rights violations and root causes that give rise to conflict	**3.1 Peace Processes** Reaching and sustaining peace through inclusive peace agreements, conflict resolution and peacebuilding initiatives	**3.2 Political Governance** National and local level governance is more inclusive and accountable, by strengthening political parties and parliament and promoting democratic space and inclusive political decision-making.
Outputs (approach)	1.1.1 International level: Projects and policy influencing at international level aimed at increasing number of women in peacekeeping missions and promoting gender-sensitivity among peacekeepers (1325 agenda)	1.2.1 International level: Policy promotion for universal acceptance as well as the implementation of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention (APMBC)	1.3.1 International level: Active partnership in Community of Practitioners, in order to support active role of the UN and promote cooperation with likeminded countries	2.1.1 Access to justice projects (with a special focus on women, IDPs and refugees)	2.2.1 Justice sector and legal reform projects	2.3.1 Transitional justice projects (e.g. technical assistance, documentation, awareness raising and capacity building)	3.1.1 Support to strengthen third-party mediation in peace processes aimed at reaching inclusive peace agreements	3.2.1 Support to formal and informal governance mechanisms such as political parties, parliaments and other representative bodies
	1.1.2 Policy/national level: Policy influencing/development in stabilization meetings for long-term stabilization lens in NL SSR policy.		1.3.2 policy/national level: Promotion of PVE relevance of regular development programmes through PVE Toolkit (Joint security/development effort)	2.1.2 Policy promotion of access to justice (e.g. through SDG16, Task Force on Justice, Advisory Boards, EU and UN)	2.2.2 Policy work on justice sector reform (e.g. Constitutional or legal reform), or at international level (e.g. EU and UN)	2.3.2 Policy work on transitional justice (e.g. EU and UN, transitional justice as prevention)	3.1.2 Support to strengthening of national and/or local level conflict resolution and peacebuilding mechanisms	3.2.2 Strengthening the social contract by supporting civil society engagement and increasing people's engagement in and access to political decision-making

	1.1	1.2	1.3	2.1	2.2	2.3	3.1	3.2
	1.1.3 Institutional level: Support to the formal security sector to strengthen reform processes and ensure that systems are in place for increased accountability, transparency, gender-sensitivity and responsiveness to the needs of citizens and government	1.2.3 Institutional level: Technical assistance and capacity building through partners to strengthen capacity of national and local mine action authorities to effectively address mine/IED-related concerns (mine action)	1.3.3 Institutional level: Support to national/local authorities in addressing root causes and triggers of violent extremism, particularly through security and RoL (push factors)	2.1.3 Policy advice on specialized topics such as informal justice and gender issues	2.2.3 Strengthened dialogue between government and CSOs on justice needs and justice reform	2.3.3 Transitional justice innovations	3.1.3 Policy influencing on strengthening the effectiveness of in-country multilateral and regional conflict resolution and peacebuilding interventions	3.2.3 Policy influencing on aspects of political governance and state building
	1.1.4 Community level: Support to community-based security sector providers to strengthen effective, accountable and responsive to the citizens and government	1.2.4 Community level: Support programmes for clearance of mines and explosive remnants of war, and an increased awareness of mine-related risks and support to mine victims	1.3.4 Community level: Support to programmes that offer vulnerable target groups and individuals alternatives to radicalization and guidance in choosing alternatives (pull factors)	2.1.4 Justice innovations	2.2.4 Strengthened leadership for justice reform	2.3.4 Expanding the evidence base (e.g. justice needs surveys, perception studies)	3.1.4 Expanding the evidence base for Dutch policies on peace processes (e.g. understanding drivers of conflict, studies on conflict dynamics and conflict resolution mechanisms)	3.2.4 Expanding the evidence base (e.g. perception surveys on inclusive political governance and studies on civil society engagement in governance processes)
				2.1.5 Expanding the evidence base (e.g. justice needs surveys, perception studies)	2.2.5 Expanding the evidence base (e.g. justice needs surveys, perception studies, relevant SDG16 data)			

| Standard indicators | *a) Number of formal/informal institutions strengthened in the field of human security[1]*

 b) Number of people trained in the field of human security[2] | | | *a) Number of beneficiaries (f/m) with access to justice (separate out: no. of women who present cases of sexual violence or domestic abuse)*

 b) Number of people (f/m) reached through justice awareness campaigns

 c) Number of focus countries where the quality of justice institutions is improved in terms of fairness, impartiality, independence or accountability

 d) Number of (formal/informal) justice institutions strengthened in terms of fairness, effectiveness, accountability or independence | | | *a) Number of conflicts (local/national/regional) that have been addressed*

 b) Number of dialogue processes organized for (local/national/regional) conflict management

 c) Number of people (f/m) trained in conflict resolution skills

 d) Number of initiatives by (local/national/regional) authorities to hold public consultations on laws and policies | |
| | *1.1a Demonstrable changes in laws and policies that lead to more effective, accountable, inclusive, transparent* | *1.2a m2 (%) of land released through TS/clearance used for a) agriculture, b) industrial, c) community development, c) natural resources, d) housing, e) infrastructure* | *1.3a Demonstrable changes in beneficiaries' perception and/or behavior regarding violent extremist groups/organiz* | | | | | |

[1] disaggregated per type of institution: security provider (e.g. police, gendarmerie, border guards), government body (e.g. parliament, ministries), oversight body (e.g. ombudsman), civil society organization (e.g. women and youth groups, radio stations), mine action operator.

[2] disaggregated by category: e.g. peacekeepers, police officers, prison wards, members of parliament, journalists, medics, deminers, risk education teachers, community focal points, members of civil society organizations, gender officers, PVE councilors, members of the Dutch Civil Mission Pool, etc.

and responsive security institutions

1.1.b Demonstrable changes in practices and behaviour of formal/inform al security providers regarding their responsivenes s to local security needs (e.g. increased trust, increased satisfaction with services)

1.1.c Demonstrable changes in laws, policies and practices that further the participation for women in peacekeeping operations | 1.2b Number of (%) direct beneficiaries surveyed reporting feeling safer following land release and RE activities

1.2c Number of (%) direct beneficiaries surveyed reporting increased knowledge of and demonstrating safe behaviour towards the dangers of ERW/mines following RE activities

1.2d Number of (%) direct beneficiaries surveyed reporting improved livelihoods as a result of mine action activities

1.2e Number of (%) direct beneficiaries surveyed reporting improved access to services and infrastructure as a result of mine action activities

1.2.4a Number square meters (m2) of land released
1.2.4b Number of direct mine risk education beneficiaries

1.2.4c Number direct clearance beneficiaries

1.2.4d Number of victims assisted | ations
1.3b Number of beneficiaries who report they have access to viable (livelihood) alternatives to those offered by extremist groups

 1.3.2 Number of SROL programs that target communities/gr oups identified as susceptive to violent extremism, which are considered PVE-relevant based on PVE Toolkit scan | e) Number of inclusive law and policy reform initiatives advanced

f) Number of perception studies and justice needs surveys conducted with NL support | e) Number of people (f/m) that have been trained in political governance activities

f) Number of (local/regional/national) authorities participating in existing infrastructures for peace

g) Number of studies on drivers of conflict or political governance perception surveys conducted with NL support |